



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/394,428

09/13/1999

CHARILAOS CHRISTOPOULOS

2466-35

4221

23117

7590

01/12/2006

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC  
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

SENI, BEHROOZ M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**MAILED**

**JAN 11 2006**

**Technology Center 2600**

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/394,428  
Filing Date: September 13, 1999  
Appellant(s): CHRISTOPOULOS ET AL.

---

John R. Lastova

For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed May 07, 2003.

***Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

The brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief. Therefore, it is presumed that there are none. The Board, however, may exercise its discretion to require an explicit statement as to the existence of any related appeals and interferences.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) *Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) *Issues***

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) *Grouping of Claims***

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20 and 21 either stand or fall together and claims 11, 14, 16 and 19 either stand or fall together and claims 23 and 24 either stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

**(8) Claims Appealed**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(9) Prior Art of Record**

5,107,345	LEE	5-1991
5,870,146	ZHU	1-1997

**(10) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1, 2, 4, 10 – 12, 14 – 16 and 18 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 5,107,345). This rejection is set forth-in prior Office Action, Paper No. 9, and dated 10-29-2002.

Claims 9, 22, 23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 5,107,345) in view of Zhu (US 5,870,146). This rejection is set forth-in prior Office Action, Paper No. 9, and dated 10-29-2002.

**(11) Response to Argument**

Appellant alleges (Brief, pages 7-8) that Lee does not teach calculating DCT of length  $N/2$ ,  $N$  being positive integer, to produce two sequence of coefficients of length  $N/2$ , of an original sequence of values of length  $N$ . Examiner respectfully disagrees.

With reference to the language of claim 1, Lee teaches dividing the block into sub-block and performing DCT (calculating) by properly choosing the block size based on image characteristics, which are being dictated by the process, and reconstructed back to the original block of  $N$  (see figure 6, which shows division of blocks and